

Remarks:

Claims 39-59 remain for consideration in this application with claims 39, 50, and 59 being in independent format. Claims 34-38 have been canceled and all of the remaining claims are new. However, claim 59 is the same as claim 33, which was inadvertently canceled in the last response. This happened because claim 33 was not included in any of the groupings of claims that were set forth in the restriction requirement. Accordingly, applicant requests consideration of this claim with the currently selected group of claims.

Claims 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. These claims have been canceled and the new claims have addressed all of the issued noted in the action, including the linking of the detection of the HLA-F antibody with the methods steps recited in the claims, the antecedent basis for “the individual,” the “immunological pair” which can form an “immune complex,” and the “it” in claim 34. Accordingly, applicants assert that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as unpatentable over Morin in view of Sasse et al. The present claims diagnose cancer that is non-specific to an organ by detecting an anti-HLA-F antibody in a body fluid by using an HLA-F antigen. Specifically, as described in the examples, the present invention permits the detection of liver cancer, stomach cancer, uterine cancer, breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, ovarian cancer, and other cancers simultaneously by using the same reagent (i.e., the HLA-F antigen). This is an improvement over the prior art methods which detect cancer that is specific to an organ, namely ovarian cancer. Given that a general diagnosis of cancer does not necessarily target subjects who have a possibility of having a cancer in a non-specific organ, the ability to detect a cancer in a number of organs all at once by using the same reagent is extremely useful in the art and a distinct

advantage to such patients. Such a limitation was not taught or suggested by the cited references and, therefore, applicants assert that the rejection has been overcome.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited herein.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP

By



Tracey S. Trautt, Reg. No. 43,205
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City MO 64108
(816) 474-9050

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)